

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,818	10/674,818 10/01/2003		Masahiro Yamamoto	088473-0154	8776
22428	7590	06/16/2006		EXAMINER	
FOLEY AT		ONER LLP	BALDWIN, KATHLEEN C		
3000 K STF			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	TON, DC	20007	3682		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/674,818	YAMAMOTO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kathleen Baldwin	3682				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)☐ 3)☐	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 Fe</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. noe except for formal matters, pro					
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Applicati	on Papers						
10) 🖾 -	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 October 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). njected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	r (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notico 3) 🔯 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/1/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail D					

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page
 line 18, spelling error, "...upper limit of torque is ...".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The disclosure does not explicitly disclose details of the smoothing process of the signals.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

 Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re clm 4, the term "smoothing processing" in line 2 is indefinite. What is smoothing processing of the signal?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tokoro et al. (US Patent Number 4,631,043).

Re clm 1, 4, and 7, Tokoro ('043) discloses a system for controlling a V-belt type continuously variable transmission (CVT) (4) for a vehicle, comprising: a source of a line pressure (c1, I 9-10), primary (6,7) and secondary (8,9) pulleys arranged on input and output sides, the pulleys being subjected to primary-pulley and secondary pulley pressures produced from the line pressure, a V-belt (11) looped over the primary (6,7) and secondary (8,9) pulleys (see figure 10), the V-belt (11) engaging in V-grooves of the primary (6,7) and secondary pulleys (8,9), the V-grooves being changed in width through a differential pressure between the primary-pulley (6,7) and secondary-pulley (8,9) pressures to achieve a target shift ratio of the CVT (c2, I29-46); and an electronic control unit (ECU) (100) which controls the line pressure, the ECU (100) being programmed to: input a

first torque signal (from torque sensor 29) obtained by estimating an engine torque in accordance with vehicle operating conditions and the target shift ratio (c4, l32-46, c2, l29-46); input a second torque signal (from torque sensor 30) obtained by detecting the engine torque, synthesize the first and second torque signals to provide an estimated-torque signal (c2, l40; a ratio is calculated), and control the line pressure in accordance with the estimated-torque signal (c2, l29-46).

Re clm 2, 5, and 8, ToKoro ('043) discloses the ECU is further programmed to set the first torque signal as the estimated-torque signal when the engine torque rises (inherent, if not disclosed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokoro ('043) in view of Hendriks et al. (US Patent 5,431,602).

Re clm 3, 6, and 9, Tokoro ('043) discloses all of the claim limitations (as described above).

Tokoro ('043) does not disclose the ECU is further programmed to: subject the first torque signal to differential processing and smoothing processing; determine a sum of the first torque signal as subjected and the second torque signal, and determine a greater one of the first and second torque signals, determine a smaller one of the sum and the greater one; and set the smaller one as the estimated-torque signal.

Hendriks ('602) teaches an ECU that subjects the first torque signal to differential processing and smoothing processing (averaging device 22 and summing device 25); determine a sum of the first torque signal as subjected and the second torque signal and determine a greater one of the first and second torque signals(summing device 25; c 6, I 50-60; c 7, I 15-25), determine a smaller one of the sum and the greater one; and set the smaller one as the estimated-torque signal (c 6, I1-27). Hendriks ('602) teaches the advantage of the processing of the control units is improved efficiency and an extended life (c1, I 37-41).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the ECU of Tokoro ('043) to subject the first torque signal to differential processing and smoothing processing; determine a sum of the first torque signal as subjected and the second torque signal, and determine a greater one of the first and second torque signals, determine a smaller one of the sum and the greater one; and set the smaller one as the

estimated-torque signal, as taught by Hendriks ('602), to improve the efficiency and life of the system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hendriks (5,337,628), Matsuda (5,776,028), Asayama (6,454,675) and Yamamoto (6,919,269) disclose a CVT system with an ECU that controls the line pressure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathleen Baldwin whose telephone number is 571-272-8973. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Ridley can be reached on 571-272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB 6/7/06



RICHARD RIDLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER